

V. REMARKS

Claim 14 is objected to because of an informality. The claim is canceled and as a result the rejection is now moot. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3-11 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Muir in view of Ozaki and further in view of Inoue. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 7 have been amended as follows:

- i) A reflection device/plate is amended as a reflection film;
- ii) The reflection film has light transmission areas each of which corresponds to each of the symbol display parts to see and recognize the symbols displayed on each symbol display part;
- iii) Also, the reflection film has a light reflection area formed around the light transmission areas to reflect the light from the light guide device toward the liquid crystal panel; and
- iv) The liquid crystal panel is arranged so as to cover not only the light transmission areas but also the light reflection area.

According to the inventions of claims 1 and 7, the light transmission areas and the light reflection area are formed on the reflection film, and at the same time the liquid crystal panel is arranged so that it covers not only the light transmission areas but also the light reflection area. Therefore, it is possible to clearly illuminate and display images to be displayed on the liquid crystal panel corresponding to the light reflection area of the reflection film, through the light reflected by the light reflection area.

On the other hand, any of Muir, Ozaki and Inoue does not at all teach or suggest that the light transmission areas and the light reflection area are formed on the reflection film and the liquid crystal panel is arranged so as to cover not only the light transmission areas but also the light reflection area. Also, there is no motivation for conceiving the

reflection film of amended claims 1 and 7 in any of Muir, Ozaki and Inoue. Therefore, the inventions of claim 1 and 7 cannot be conceived by combination of Muir, Ozaki and Inoue in any manner and the above-described effect of the invention cannot be produced.

It is respectfully submitted that that none of the applied art, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the features of claims 1 and 7 as amended and discussed above. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art could not combine the features of the applied art to arrive at the claimed invention because the applied art is devoid of all the features of the claimed invention. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 7 are allowable over the applied art.

In conclusion, claims 1 and 7 are not obvious over the cited references and deemed to be allowed.

Claims 4-6 depend from claim 1 and includes all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features they recite.

Claims 9-11 depend from claim 7 and includes all of the features of claim 7. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason claim 7 is allowable as well as for the features they recite.

Claims 3 and 8 are incorporated into claims 1 and 7, respectively. Thus, the claims have been cancelled.

Also, claims 12 to 14 have been cancelled. As a result, the rejection as applied thereto is now moot.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New claim 15 has been drafted which recites the limitation that the light reflection area of the reflection film is formed by depositing silver layer on the base film.


Further, Applicants assert that there are also reasons other than those set forth above why the pending claims are patentable. Applicants hereby reserve the right to submit those other reasons and to argue for the patentability of claims not explicitly addressed herein in future papers.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper or if a Petition for Extension of Time is required for timely acceptance of the same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 18-0013 for any such fees and Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Carl Schaukowitch
Reg. No. 29,211

Date: May 27, 2008

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
1233 20th Street, N.W. Suite 501
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 955-3750
Fax: (202) 955-3751
Customer No. 23353

Enclosure(s): Amendment Transmittal

DC315513.DOC